



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,746	09/30/2003	Harold N. Rosenstock	IS01415MCG	7946
27572	7590	07/25/2008	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				LAZARO, DAVID R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2155				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/25/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Continuation Sheet - Advisory**

**11. Continued:**

Applicant argues on pages 12-13 of the remarks that the examiner has failed to provide a reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would consider modifying Pfister by further providing derived database elements. Particularly, applicant argues that Pfister in fact teaches away from any further methods for maintaining consistent data and that one of ordinary skill in the art wont not consider modifying Pfister to include the technique of computing independent derived database elements.

Examiner's response - As noted by applicant, Pfister merely describes two **basic ways** to handle the failover (Page 7 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph). As such, Pfister is only describing the basic steps of using either replication or switchover. It is easy to reason that the derived tables could be used in the replication method as part of maintaining the separate copies required in the replication method. While Pfister states replication and switchover are the only ways to achieve failover, Pfister does not state that the replication method must be done specifically as described. As mentioned before, Pfister in fact states that only the basic method is being described. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the replication method can be altered to include additional techniques to further insure data consistency between subnet managers.

Applicant argues on page 13 of the remarks that the proposed combination does not teach or suggest computing database elements independent of the subnet manager that assumes the master function.

Examiner's response - Neither of the cited reference teaches a dependency on a master subnet manager or other master entity in relation to derived database elements. As such, the derived database elements are computed independent of a master entity.

**13. Continued:**

Claims 1-21 remain rejected under the grounds of rejection presented in the 02/06/2008 office action except as follows.

The rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn based on the amended claims.